

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

LEO CONO,
Plaintiff,
v.
AVALON BAY COMMUNITIES, INC., et
al.,
Defendants.
Case No. 2:18-cv-0482-APG-VCF
**Order Accepting Report and
Recommendation and Dismissing Case**
(ECF Nos. 7, 10, 12)

On May 1, 2018, Magistrate Judge Ferenbach entered his Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of plaintiff Leo Cono's Second Amended Complaint. ECF No. 7. Judge Ferenbach previously dismissed Cono's original complaint because it was incoherent (ECF No. 3), and Cono filed an Amended Complaint (ECF No. 5) and a Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 6). Since Judge Ferenbach's recommendation to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint, Cono has filed two additional amended complaints (ECF Nos. 8, 12) and an objection and two motions for more time to file another amended complaint (ECF No. 10, 12).

I have conducted a de novo review of the issues set forth in the Report and Recommendation under Local Rule IB 3-2. When considering Cono’s application to proceed in forma pauperis, the court must review Cono’s complaint to determine whether the complaint is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a plausible claim. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Judge Ferenbach’s original order pointed out that Cono’s allegations made no sense and did not make out a plausible claim for relief. ECF No. 3. Cono’s subsequent pleadings and filings do not cure those defects. To the contrary, they worsen the problem by adding scores of new defendants and new allegations that are equally far-fetched. Cono’s allegations do not cross “the line from conceivable to plausible,” and thus they do not state a claim for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 680 (2009) (quotation omitted).

1 This court cannot exercise diversity jurisdiction over Cono's complaint because he is a
2 Nevada resident and several of the purported defendants are Nevada citizens. The complaint fails
3 to allege sufficient facts to give rise to a plausible claim under federal law, so the court cannot
4 exercise federal question jurisdiction.¹

5 Cono has filed four proposed amended complaints in addition to his original complaint.
6 None of those pleadings cures the defects pointed out above. It is apparent that Cono cannot
7 properly plead his claims, so I will dismiss this case without leave to amend.

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (**ECF No. 7**) is accepted,
9 Cono's motions (**ECF Nos. 10, 12**) are DENIED, and this case is DISMISSED. The clerk of the
10 court shall enter Judgment accordingly and close the case.

11 Dated: June 1, 2018.



12 ANDREW P. GORDON
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ¹ Judge Ferenbach also correctly notes that it is highly doubtful whether this court can exercise
28 personal jurisdiction over many of the purported defendants. But that is a question for another
day, and perhaps another case, as this case is being closed and no further proceedings will be
entertained.